

KAMPE HITLER WAS A LIBERAL

HX
87
K325

LIBRARY
OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

Library
of the
Ohio State University

Presented by

Gordon Hullfish

*Hitler
was a
Liberal*

by JOSEPH P. KAMP

It is of more than passing interest that "liberal" and "liberty" are only a few words removed from each other in the dictionary, for the two are actually kindred in application. As there can be no liberty without liberalism, so there can be no practical liberalism without considerable freedom for the individual.

All manner of self-professed liberals have endowed the word with interpretations of their own. Cloaking the most nonliberal purposes with the bright garment of human dignity, they have succeeded only in bringing one of the greatest words in our language into general disrepute.

The Latin "liberalis" means free, and thus the word in its basic source means freedom as opposed to slavery. Thus, by definition, a liberal must first of all be an advocate of freedom for the individual under a system of free government. It follows that the slave states, Communist and Fascist alike, can hardly square their status with the philosophy of life practiced by a true liberal.

When the pseudo-liberal advocates systems of government which would place chains upon the hands and minds of men, he does it out of deliberate malice or from the depths of unbelievable ignorance, either of which constitutes an offense against mankind.

The liberalism of the true despot and his dupes had its ultimate expression in the concentration camps and the cremation ovens of Adolf Hitler only a few years ago. Today millions of slaves in the Soviet Union bear grim witness to another great tragedy. The liberal apologists for this crime against humanity do nothing to restore its proper dignity and station to a magnificent word.

— Congressman Donald L. Jackson

Feb. 25, 1949



HITLER WAS A LIBERAL

by JOSEPH P. KAMP

MOST Americans, both Democrats and Republicans, like to think of themselves as "liberals," probably because the term somewhat vaguely connotes intelligent, fair-minded and forward-looking objectivity in matters political and economic. Besides, it's fashionable to be "liberal." And most people want to be in fashion.

To call Hitler, the man responsible for the greatest catastrophe of modern times, a "liberal," may well shock a Nation that sacrificed so many of its sons, and gutted and nearly bankrupted itself, to vanquish Hitler's Nazi legions. Yet, Hitler's ideology and program are shockingly parallel to the philosophy and measures currently expounded and promoted by a powerful clique of Americans who have the effrontery to call themselves "liberals."

This same "liberal" clique hails the results at the polls in the 1948 election as a "liberal" victory and a "mandate" from the American people for a "liberal" legislative program, a program which is strikingly similar to proposals set forth in Hitler's *Mein Kampf*.

The paradox is due to the Red political smog which has been systematically exuded over our people to becloud

their understanding of this time-honored and deeply-cherished American characteristic.

There has been so much of this "liberal" talk since the election that leading newspapers from coast-to-coast have been asking the question: "What is a liberal?" And thousands of readers have favored them with "answers," the gist of which, in the main, is confusion worse confounded, and proves little more than that Americans have lost the old-fashioned art of definition.

You can't define a dog by describing a dachshund; else a Great Dane could not be classified as a dog. By the same token, you can't enter a rabbit in a dog show, merely by calling him "Fido," and putting him on a leash.

Nor can you define a liberal by describing the peculiarities of current self-styled "liberals;" else Benjamin Franklin, Thomas Jefferson and Woodrow Wilson would not qualify as liberals. Nor can you palm off some pro-Communist extremist like Henry Wallace as a liberal, simply because he claims to be one.

And you can't accept a definition based on *one* alleged characteristic, regardless of how popular the conception, or misconception, may be. A liberal is *not* just somebody who is liberal with other people's money.

A definition should give all the essential elements (and only the essential elements) that constitute the thing defined, and then should be applied only to such as actually merit the definition.

So, to define a liberal is no easy task, even if we limit ourselves to the social-minded "liberal" who contradistinguishes himself from those loosely known as conservatives. For the truth is that a man can, at one and the same time, be both somewhat of a *liberal*, and somewhat

of a *conservative*, just as a man can be both a lawyer and a politician.

Roughly speaking, Americans are divided into clergymen, ball players, actors, housewives, etc., etc.—not because some know only theology, and others know how to bake a cake; but because of professional or selective stress. Many an actor can play ball; many a ball player can act.

You cannot define the spectrum by simply describing black and white. Why conclude that thinkers must be divided into two conflicting groups by the simple process of labeling them conservative and liberal? Why not consider the matter of emphasis or stress?

A man who is *conspicuously* prudent in holding on to his money is considered thrifty. A man who is *conspicuously* generous with his money is considered financially liberal. If his thrift becomes fanatical, he is a miser. If his liberality is extravagant, he is a wastrel.

As the song goes, "there's a little bit of bad in every good little girl." And, as the facts go, there *can* be a whole lot of liberalism in a real conservative, and a whole lot of conservatism in a true liberal.

A REAL LIBERAL, then, is one with generous mental horizons. He is open-minded, looks at both sides of a question. He has foresight as well as hindsight. He knows the past, and resolutely faces the future. He is not rutted in iron-clad tradition, nor given to impracticable wishful thinking. He judges an issue in the light of fact and existing circumstance, and is not unduly swayed either by precept or roseate promise.

He has common sense, good will and a profound belief in individual rights and liberties.

He knows the value of the social system under which

this Republic has been so signally blessed. He recognizes its faults as well as its virtues, and looks to the future for even greater progress.

He believes in orderly progress.

He knows that progress means change; not any kind of change, but the kind that goes hand in hand with the conservation of the things that keep change from degenerating into decay or disastrous revolution; the kind that will elaborate the blessings we already have into the maximum measure of life, liberty and happiness for all our people.

But the self-styled "liberal" of our day and time does not measure up to this definition. For the most part, his "liberalism" is characterized by VIOLENT OPPOSITION TO THE ESTABLISHED ORDER; which, according to him, has plenty of faults and few virtues; he is "all out" for revolutionary change—*without a serious thought as to the consequences*; he admits that there are two sides to every question—but *the other side* is always "reactionary;" he claims an open mind on everything—provided that it all conforms to his own view.

Above all things, tolerance is the essence of liberalism; but there is no tolerance in our modern "liberal," for his principal trait is a contemptuous intolerance of all opposing views.

History's original liberals rose up against the rigid state economic controls of the French Mercantilists. Our Colonial liberals fought for a minimum of government consistent with the welfare of all the people, and wrote the Constitution of the United States to assure just such a minimum.

Our modern "liberals" want more and *more* govern-

ment in our everyday affairs, they seek new ways to evade or nullify the Constitution, they *demand* rigid economic controls—price controls, wage controls, rationing and allocations.

Old-fashioned liberals were concerned about the well-being of their society whenever any *special interest* approached a position where its economic or political power reached threatening proportions.

Our NEW “liberals” are concerned mainly with the well-being of one economic group to the exclusion, and even to the detriment, of all others. They not only condone, they fight for the *special interest* of “labor” even to the point where its economic and political power menaces the general welfare.

The traditional liberal considered taxes as a necessary means for supporting the Government and its public services.

Our present-day professional “liberal” insists that taxes be imposed to punish or harass the successful individual or corporation.

Scratch a professional “liberal” and, *nine times out of ten*, you’ll find a Socialist, perhaps even a Communist — at least a “revolutionary” who, while waving the Flag, is waging a cold war on what that Flag represents.

The *tenth* professional “liberal” is either a confused “do-gooder,” an exhibitionist searching for a little lime-light, or an unprincipled political opportunist fishing for votes.

As a result, the term “liberal” is being terribly abused. It has come to be used as an adjective, like Christian or God-fearing. It is being overworked to put over personalities, policies and programs of varying shades of red.

In fact, Socialism has now become liberalism to too

many Americans, And, as evidence of their own "liberalism" (non-Socialist, of course), many of these Americans give hearty approval to such Socialist pseudo-liberalism.

A good example of this confusion is the announcement, on March 5, 1949, that Norman Thomas is to write a syndicated newspaper column, and the statement by Palmer Hoyt, editor and publisher of the *Denver Post*, that Thomas "will not be writing as a Socialist crusader, but rather will be reporting and giving his liberal views on national and global affairs."

Mr. Thomas is that "mild" Socialist "liberal" who was reported in the *New York Times* of Feb. 13, 1949, as saying: "Perhaps the greatest triumph of the Russian dictatorship to date is this: it has taught the lesson that has been implicit in the specialization and interdependence of the machine age—plan or perish."

Socialists just want to "plan" our lives for us, nothing more. What could be more reasonable, more liberal? Can Americans be blamed for confusing Socialism with liberalism?

At the same time most Americans would be either incredulous or bitterly resentful if told that Nazism was liberalism. Yet, Nazism was nothing more or less than National Socialism. They would be equally incredulous or resentful if told that Russian Communism was liberalism. But Russian Communism is also Socialism.

True, there are striking differences between these various brands of Socialism. But THEIR SIMILARITIES are more important than THEIR DIFFERENCES. It is not fair to say that one of these differences is that Hitler's Socialism was — and Stalin's Socialism is — the opposite of liberal, which is true enough, while the other brands of Socialism

are liberal, which is not true. The facts are: Socialism is Socialism, and Socialism is never traditional liberalism.

BUT the *new* "liberalism" is something else again. Liberalism used to mean, quite simply, belief in the increased liberties of the individual man. Liberalism was rebellion against the overwhelming power of government, revolt against tyranny and despotism, insurrection against the theory of the divine right of kings or that of a ruling class. Old-fashioned liberalism believed that each individual possesses God-given inalienable rights and liberties which no government could take from him, that all men must be freed from slavery to the state.

The NEW "liberalism" believes in extending the power of the state, and in making the "common man" the ward and the slave of the state, "for his own good," of course.

This *new* "liberalism" is best exemplified by the tragic situation in middle Europe and Asia under the processes of Communist "liberation."

The travesties on justice perpetrated today by the Soviet Union and its satellites at the expense of enslaved people are not isolated instances of man's inhumanity to man. They are symptoms of a deadly evil that threatens the very existence of our civilization. That evil is a deliberate cold war systematically waged on group independence and individual freedom throughout the world.

The real power behind the scenes is not the Politburo; it is THE PHILOSOPHY OF SOCIALISM. We are inclined to think of the cold war in terms of the Kremlin, and to forget that Russian Communism is but one form of Socialism in action. The history of Soviet Socialism goes back no farther than November, 1917. Marxist So-

cialism with its plan of world revolution goes back a hundred years.

All Socialism springs from the same root and produces the same narcotic to liberty. There is no Socialism of any hue which is not based upon the sacrifice of human rights and liberties for State slavery, and all Socialism is a political pyramid dominated by a dictator and his chosen bureaucrats. Every attempt at applied Socialism in the world has resulted in a dictatorship.

Socialism, whatever its shade or form, minimizes the individual, and magnifies the State. In effect it is the control of the many by the few. In addition to exercising the usual functions of government, the State, according to Socialism, should own and operate the means of production. Instead of being endowed by God with certain inalienable rights, for whose protection the State is brought into being, the individual, according to Socialism, is the ward and servant (or slave) of the State.

This Socialist doctrine has long been promoted in America by both the Socialists and the Communists. And it is not without its element of menace to the United States today despite the fact that the Communists are now in disrepute, and have lost much of their power and influence, and notwithstanding the absurdly small number of *organized* Socialists. There is real danger now **ONLY** because in these latter days this Red philosophy has been "sold," and is being propagandized, to the American people, not as Socialism, but as "liberalism," palmed off by men who blatantly describe themselves as "Liberals" with a capital "L," as they blithely ignore the basic tenet that any Socialist government must be dictatorial.

The strength of the Socialist movement, as distinct from the Communist movement, cannot be measured by

the size of the Socialist Party. The Socialists have adopted the strategy of the Communists. They have infiltrated into all sorts of movements, like the CIO, for instance, that can be used to further their revolutionary cause. They have organized their own fronts under a variety of disarming names, one of which is called the Liberal Party in New York.

These Socialists in disguise many times appear to be nothing more sinister than mis-guided "do-gooders;" but they invariably betray themselves by overdoing the act, always patting themselves on the back for their own "enlightened liberalism," and loudly proclaiming the holiness of the "liberal" cause. Real liberals, like real saints, are not in the habit of blowing their own horns, or shouting their own virtues from the housetops.

These Socialist "liberals" have abandoned the open frankness of old-time revolutionists like Debs and De Leon; they never mention the "Socialist society" or the "Socialist state." Instead of on Socialism, their emphasis is on "**social welfare.**"

LENIN once said that "words are weapons," and that the first step in the world revolution was to "confuse the vocabularies." That Lenin's advice was not lost on American Socialists is evidenced by the latter's versatility in cornering for the Socialist "market" the most beguiling terms, while branding our traditional American system — and its defenders — with opprobrious appellations.

In the name of "social justice," "economic security," "planned economy," "industrial democracy" and "public ownership," the followers of Karl Marx, with the help of sophisticated clichés and devastating slogans, wage a relentless war on "selfish individualism," "special interests,"

"sinister forces of wealth," "economic royalists," and "privileged princes of greed" — conveniently dodging the facts that by and large the standard of living in the United States today is the highest in the entire world, and that opportunities and the good things of life are distributed more widely, more evenly and more abundantly in the United States than in any other country, anywhere, at any time, in history.

Stripped of its camouflage, SOCIALISM IS A WHOLESAL RAID ON PRIVATE PROPERTY AND INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS. It is known as Communism in Russia; in England it is called Fabianism, and functions through the British Labor Party; in this country it proudly struts as "Liberalism." Basically ALL THREE ARE IDENTICAL — differing mainly as to methods or means of achieving power — strategy and tactics, in other words.

Before the Russian Bolshevik counter-revolution, the Socialists of the world marched together under the unified command of the *Second Internationale*. Feeling their oats after the successful coup d'etat of 1917, the Russian branch of the Socialist Party lost no time in announcing that thenceforth the *Socialist Internationale* would be liquidated in favor of the *Communist or Third Internationale*, and that the *Third Internationale* would be under the absolute and exclusive control of the Russians.

That announcement split the Socialists of the world into two conflicting groups — (1) Those who accepted Soviet dictatorship, thenceforth known as Communists; and (2) those who rejected Russian domination, thenceforth known as Socialists, Fabians, etc. In Italy this rift in the Marxist forces gave birth to Fascism; in Germany to Nazism; and in this country to a motley collection of Socialist splinter movements which are now more or less loosely co-operating in the mis-called "liberal movement."

IF opposition to the conservative social order, the building of a welfare state, wholesale raids on private property and fundamental human rights (all of which the *new* "liberalism" is promoting in the United States) are the earmarks of a "Liberal," then Adolf Hitler should be enshrined as one of the mighty heroes of the "liberal movement," for who more than the paperhanger of Bavaria gave wholeheartedly of his time and genius to the "liberal" cause of destroying governments, property and human rights, and building Socialist — welfare — slave states.

Few people remember the early days of Hitler and his glowing promises to the German people. Measured by the promises of our own "liberals," Hitler, by his own words, by his own professions and promises in those days, was the greatest "liberal" that ever lived. He promised labor higher wages and full annual employment. He promised the farmer land reform. He promised every German a more abundant life. He promised to give the underdog a break. He promised everybody a fair deal. And on top of every other conceivable benefit he promised every family an automobile, a "Volkswagen." Remember?

Hitler's program sounded good and it looked good because it was labeled "social progress." "Let the State take care of all your worries," was the alluring theme. Who could then dispute the claim that it would provide "the greatest good to the greatest number?"

Hitler considered himself the architect of a "new" socialist economy that would bring peace, justice and security to *every* German. Of course it would take planning. But only a handful of people — those who agreed with him — could "properly" plan the destinies of 80,000,000 Germans. However, before long "for their own good," Hitler took over the affairs of the 80,000,000; all

their affairs to the most personal, including religion and birth rate. He did it mainly by hypnotizing the people into selling their birthright of freedom for a mess of pottage called SECURITY, the while his planners planned Germany into conquest, chaos and catastrophe. And they came pretty near wrecking the world.

The American people had a preliminary taste of Hitler's kind of "planned economy" in the bureaucracy and super-Government control under OPA. Today, some of the same Marxist-minded bureaucrats, and their Socialist friends, under the stolen cloak of "liberalism," by means of intrigue and double-talk, are holding out the promise of putative peace, justice and SECURITY to the American people in exchange for their freedom.

Hitler destroyed the German Republic. Our "liberals" — whether they know it or not — are trying to destroy the American system of society and government.

Hitler had a 25-point program which is set forth in Publication 1864 of the U. S. Department of State. Our "liberals" are now fighting to put over at least 13 of those points as the foundation of an American Welfare State.

Consider a few:

Hitler proposed "nationalization of education to give equality of advantages to all." Our "liberals" demand Federal Aid to Education — the prelude to "nationalization."

Hitler demanded "equal rights for all German citizens." Our "liberals" demand an F. E. P. C. law.

Hitler promised "old age pensions." Our "liberals" propose increased old age pensions and expanded Social Security.

Hitler sponsored "nationalization of public health service." Our "liberals" are backing Socialized Medicine.

Hitler demanded the "nationalization of trusts." Our "liberals" want 19 more TVAs and the right to "nationalize" our steel industry as a starter.

Hitler was for "a strong central state power." Our "liberals" want all Government power to be concentrated in a bureaucratized executive department, and to make Congress a "rubber stamp."

Hitler did something else that is "happening here." He concentrated the taxing power in Berlin, and doled back locally collected tax money to local politicians who did his bidding. Thus he broke down local self-government which was in Germany, as it has been in the United States, the bulwark of freedom.

ALTHOUGH Hitler stood for so many things our "liberals" stand for, he did not have the gall to call his program "liberalism." He called it Socialism.

It was Socialism there; it would be Socialism here . . . under *any* name.

And the world now knows what happens when the welfare of a people and the destiny of a nation are committed to a SOCIALIST WELFARE STATE.

Yet, in February, 1949, Justice William O. Douglas, a leading "liberal" of the current school, told a public gathering at Occidental College that a remedy was needed for the ills of our American economic and political system. That remedy, he said, "is the creation of a HUMAN WELFARE STATE — the greatest political invention of the twentieth century."

But Donald Richberg, a real liberal who sickened of

this phony "liberalism" after his experience as NRA Administrator, gave another view in an address at American University in Washington, D. C. That a HUMAN WELFARE STATE is not liberalism but the worst kind of Socialism or Nazism is clear in his warning:

"It has been made evident that the regulation of daily living and working conditions of millions of people is only practical through the issuance of volumes of bureaucratic regulations to be applied by a multitude of petty officials, whose speedy and necessarily arbitrary decisions must be enforced by the hurried prosecution and harsh punishment of offenders.

"The traditional protection of the individual against abuses of official authority, which we call 'due process of law,' cannot be maintained.

"In a word, a comprehensive welfare state must be A POLICE STATE."

Hitler is dead. But his kind of "Liberalism" and its blood-brother, COMMUNISM, go marching on. Both groups are now throwing rocks at each other in a family fight. But they both are dedicated to the "liberal" task of destroying the Republic that Washington fought to establish, that Lincoln died to preserve, and which the whole American people but so recently, and at such tremendous cost and sacrifice, defended from the iron heel of Socialist despotism and tyranny.

God save the United States from Stalin's Communism, and from ANY kind of Hitler's Socialist "liberalism!"



"President Truman, through Secretary of Agriculture Charles Brannan, today transmitted to Congress his presidential economic program for the coming year, and without openly proposing a complete socialistic State, it goes as far in that direction as possible. It does not actually abolish the capitalistic system in the United States, immediately and completely, but until the complete and full package comes along, this ought to serve the purpose.

"It calls, of course, for price and wage control powers for the president, premised only upon his finding that prices have risen or are **THREATENING TO RISE** sufficiently above the level at which they stood on December 31st of the year just past, to alter the cost of living. That ought not to be a very difficult thing for Presidential advisers to find, if they're in that mood . . .

"The really important provision, however, is the one which gives the President the authority, if he sees fit, to go into any line of industrial operation—steel, automobile building, toy-making, home building, anything else—if he feels that it is necessary and if he feels that private enterprise is not producing at a sufficient rate of speed to meet public demands.

"There is socialism's foot in the door, and you might just as well be realistic and face the facts. It means that if you are running a private enterprise, and are paynig taxes, the government has the authority to open up a competitive business to yours, across the street, and compete with you, paying no taxes whatsoever and having the full resources of the United States Treasury behind it.

"That would seem to be an issue that calls for a real expression of public sentiment to the White House and to Congress."

— FULTON LEWIS, JR.

Feb. 15, 1949

CONSTITUTIONAL EDUCATIONAL LEAGUE, INC.

342 Madison Avenue, New York 17, N. Y.

I enclose \$.....(cash, stamps, money order or check) for which please send me the following literature:

- _____ **HITLER WAS A LIBERAL**, 15 cents each; 10 for \$1.00;
Copies \$8.00 per hundred.
- _____ **BEHIND THE LACE CURTAINS OF THE YWCA**, 50 cents
Copies each; 3 for \$1.00; \$30 per hundred.
- _____ **COMMENT ON COMMUNISTS AND COMMUNISM**, a 48-
Copies page pamphlet of quotes about Communism by outstanding
citizens and leading Communists. 25 cents each; 6 for \$1.00;
\$10 per hundred.
- _____ **WAGE SLAVES IN AMERICA**, a broadside making a com-
Copies parison between wages, working and living conditions in
Communist Russia, Socialist England, and Free Enterprise
America. 10 cents each; 12 for \$1.00; \$7.50 per hundred.
- _____ **HIGH TAXES . . . THE QUICK WAY TO COMMUNISM.**
Copies (Penny Pamphlet Series No. 8) One cent each.
- _____ **VOTE CIO . . . AND GET A SOVIET AMERICA.** A 68-page
Copies documented booklet exposing Communist political activity
through labor unions. 25 cents each; 5 for \$1.00; \$15 per
hundred.
- _____ **WITH LOTIONS OF LOVE**—the biographical booklet
Copies Walter Winchell wouldn't want you to read. 35 cents each;
4 for \$1.00; \$20 per hundred.
- _____ **OPEN LETTER TO CONGRESS: "Gentlemen: Are you Mice
Copies or Men?"** Things you never thought could happen in America
are revealed in this 68-page booklet, documented with photo-
stats, etc. 50 cents each; 3 for \$1.00; \$30 per hundred.
- _____ **COMMUNISM is UN-AMERICAN and COMMUNISM is a
Copies MENACE.** Twin booklet containing articles by Francis
Cardinal Spellman and J. Edgar Hoover. Single copy, FREE.
10 cents each up to 50 copies; \$5.00 per hundred.
- _____ **SPECIAL DOSSIER OF PATRIOTIC LITERATURE.** Over
Sets 50 booklets, pamphlets, etc., including all those listed above
and many other informative titles. Only \$5 per set.

I also enclose \$.....as my contribution in support of your educational program and to assist in circulating patriotic literature.

NAME

ADDRESS

"... Despite all the lip service to private enterprise, the President's program leads straight to socialism as must any program which rests on the assumption that the Government is responsible for the economic welfare of every citizen, that the Government must give him federalized medical care and subsidized housing, underwrite farm prices and dictate the minimum which people may accept as wages and how much they shall be permitted to retain as profit, in the unlikely event that the concept of profit can survive such a hodgepodge of mothering. The people didn't vote for socialism; they voted for Mr. Truman. Mr. Truman probably doesn't want socialism, but he has allowed a lot of CIO planners to talk him into a scheme of things which, if permitted to run its course, adds up to socialism, however the poor misbegotten thing is christened."

— SATURDAY EVENING POST

Feb. 5, 1949



Published and Distributed by
CONSTITUTIONAL EDUCATIONAL LEAGUE, INC.
342 MADISON AVENUE • NEW YORK 17, N. Y.

"The kind of dictatorship under which we may fall today is not that brought off by means of a coup d'etat and a suddenly seized power to put us all in straight jackets."

"There is a kind of dictatorship that can be brought about through a creeping paralysis of thought, readiness to accept paternalistic measures from the government and, along with those paternalistic measures, a surrender of our own responsibilities."

"If we allow this constant drift toward centralized bureaucratic government to continue it will be expressed in the practice of laying down the rules and laws for governing each of us in our daily actions."

"There'll be a swarming of bureaucrats over the land, ownership of property will gradually drift into that central government, and finally you will have to have a dictatorship to run such a huge organization."

— General Dwight D. Eisenhower

Feb. 13, 1949

"You cannot help men permanently by doing for them what they could and should do for themselves."

LINCOLN

Date Due

~~MAY 23 1966~~
~~FEB 1 1968~~

MAIN
LIBRARY MAY 9 '69

MAIN LIBRARY
CANCELLED
FEB 11 '77

ENCLOSURE

The Ohio State University



3 2435 00155 1258

HX87K325

HITLER WAS A LIBERAL

THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY BOOK DEPOSITORY



D	AISE	SECT	SHLF	SIDE	POS	ITEM	C
8	06	25	03	8	01	001	0